

Remarks:

There has been a change in the attorney prosecuting the subject application and, except as noted below, the amendments above have been requested merely to accommodate the stylistic preferences of the attorney now prosecuting the application.

The only rejections or objections are those that have been raised under 35 U.S.C. §112. No claims have been rejected on the basis of any prior art.

Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejections of claims 1-78 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, in view of some of the amendments above and the comments that follow. With respect to the objection raised against claims 1 and 78, against claims 2, 26, 47 and 59, and against claims 5, 32, 50 and 77, with respect to the Markush language, it is noted that there is no required language for claims. The language as considered in *Ex parte Markush* was found to be acceptable, but there is no requirement that a claim follow that language. In any event, however, the claims have been amended so as to obviate such objections.

With respect to the objection to the language in claims 1 and 78 regarding soluble and insoluble ferric pyrophosphate and soluble and insoluble orthophosphate, the terminology is well understood and established. In fact, the Office Action itself states that it is known that the phrase "soluble ferric pyrophosphate" means a combination of ferric pyrophosphate and sodium citrate. Accordingly, it is believed that the phrase is clear. Nevertheless, the references to "soluble" being redundant anyway,¹ the claims have been amended to obviate the subject rejection by

¹ For example, "ferric pyrophosphate" literally reads on ferric pyrophosphate whether or not the composition also contains sodium citrate and so literally reads on insoluble ferric pyrophosphate (without sodium citrate) as well as soluble ferric pyrophosphate (with sodium citrate). Thus, the separate references to "insoluble ferric pyrophosphate" and to "soluble ferric phosphate" are unnecessary.

eliminating the references to "soluble" and "insoluble" as they were applied to ferric pyrophosphate and ferric orthophosphate.

Claims 4, 49 and 53 have been amended to eliminate the objectionable reference to "in concentrate." Claims 7, 27, 52 and 60 have been amended as required to clarify the nature of the solubility.

Accordingly, all objections set forth under 35 U.S.C. §112 are believed to have been satisfied and so withdrawal of the rejections thereunder are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the application is now in allowable condition and favorable reconsideration and early allowance of claims 1-78 are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

THOMPSON COBURN LLP

By:



Kenneth Solomon
Reg. No. 31,427
One US Bank Plaza
St. Louis, Missouri 63101
(314) 552-6297